UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,471	02/07/2002	Charles Eric Hunter	**OO-0071	3041
	7590 08/07/200 WASHBURN LLP	8		IINER
CIRA CENTRE	E, 12TH FLOOR		SHANG, ANNAN Q	
2929 ARCH ST PHILADELPH	KEET IA, PA 19104-2891		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,471	HUNTER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANNAN Q. SHANG	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNION FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sound the control of the cont	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matt	•	is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14 and 18-38</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-14 and 18-38</u> is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the contact that the contact that are contact to by the contact that are contact that are contact to be contact to be contact that are contact th	accepted or b) objected to othe drawing(s) be held in abeyar orrection is required if the drawing	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 	

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of the last office action mailed on 01/25/08,

Applicant recites the claims limitations and the prior arts of record, and further argues that the prior arts of record do not teach the claims limitations (see page 8 of 16+ of Applicant Remarks).

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes Applicants arguments, i.e., that "...Dimitri does not teach recitations of claim 18..." that,"...a second medium, distinct from the first medium..." The recited claims limitations do not require the different mediums to store advertisements (ads) and movies. Dimitri discloses "...a reader mechanism having a single optical pickup and configured to read entertainment content pre-recorded..." (see abstract, figs.1B+, col.3, line 43-col.4, line 1+ and col.5, line 22-col.6, line 1+). Hence the rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations of claims 18-20, maintained as repeated below.

With respect to the 103(a) rejection of claims 1. 5-9, 11, 22-27, 30, 31, 34, 35, and 48 as being unpatentable over Lowthert in view of Sartain, Applicant further states that "...the cited references,...do not teach the recitations of claim 1..." i.e., that "...periodically distributing advertisements per..." In response to Applicant's arguments, Lowthert teaches a distributor which employs "sneakernet" a process where ads, content, info segment, etc., stored on CD-ROM, DVD, etc., are distributed via

convention mail (physical or hand delivery) to various locations (figs.1+ and page 1, [0024]) and one skill in the art knows that these distribution method is usual done periodically (monthly). Although, Lowthert sneakernet system does not distribute the same ads or other various content, but rather updates or new content, Lowthert is silent as to periodic distribution. However, in the same field of endeavor **Sartain** reference figures 1-7, discloses an interactive video system which periodically (once a day, once a week, etc.,) distributes ads and other content via overnight mail to remote sites (col.1, line 56-col.2, line 13, col.5, lines 23-43, col.8, line 29-46, col.9, line 60-col.10, line 26 and line 53-col.11, line 1+). Lowthert further disclose various payment options (e.g., "...a fee may be automatically charged to the user's predetermined account.") for the distribution or transmitting of content ([0034]), which meets the limitations "...communicating information that is representative of the playing of entertainment

Page 3

Applicant further argues of limitation "...an optical reader operating at a wavelength at or below 405nm." that "...Sandstrom describe thickness of various recording and dielectric layers, but not disclose...wavelengths..." claims 38 and claims 12-13 (page 12 of 16+).

content and advertisements between the customer and a system operator.

In response, Examiner disagrees. Lowthert teaches using standard various storage mediums (videotape, digital videotape, hard disk, CD-R, CD-RW, DVD-R, semiconductor, or any other suitable storage mechanism(s), but silent to the specification of the medium(s)., "...a disc having a diameter greater than about 125mm and less than 300mm and where the first medium comprises a disc having data

Page 4

recorded on a reflective layer and an optically transmissive coating having a total transmission of 635nm of less than the minimum transmission set forth as the standard DVD specification..." as recited in the claims. However, an analogous field endeavor, Sandstrom discloses in figures 1-2, rewritable optical data storage disk having enhanced flatness and discloses a disc having a diameter greater than about 120mm and less than 135mm and various substrate thickness and wavelength (col.1, lines 24-44, col.2, lines 24-46, col.3, line 66-col.4, line 31, col.8, line 32-col.9, line 30). Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of are disclosed in the prior art, except for size, it would have been obvious matter of design choice, since such modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component, and change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1995). Additionally, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, except for an optimum value, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reach such an optimum value, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re* Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claims the 103(a) rejection of 2-4, 14, 36 and 37, for the reasons discussed above, Examiner maintains the rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations and maintained.

As to the 103(a) rejection of claims 28-29, over Lowthert in view of Sartain and further in view of Ginter, Applicant further argues as to "...shipping entertainment

Art Unit: 2623

content...on a periodic basis..." and disagrees with the rejections. In response to Applicant's remarks, one skill in the art knows that most conventional mail distribution method is usually done periodically (monthly). Although, Lowthert sneakernet system is silent as to periodic distribution even though is clear from the disclosure that different or new ads and new content "updates" are distributed in some order to the clients.

Lowthert as modified by Sartain, teach periodic distribution of content and targeting to customer preferences, but silent as to shipping entertainment content. However, **Ginter** disclose periodic shipping entertainment content on a periodic basis and further teaches targeting content to customer, based on preferences ([0201-0203], [1049] and [1178-1182]). Hence Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The rejection is proper, meets all the claims limitations as discussed below. **This office action is made final.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Dimitri et al (6,574,424)**.

Art Unit: 2623

As to claim 18, note the **Dimitri** reference figures 1-5, discloses method and apparatus for a randomizer for DVD video and further discloses a player device configured to generate audio visual signals representative of entertainment with advertisements, the device comprising:

A Reader mechanism having a single optical pickup and configured to read entertainment content prerecorded on a first medium and to read advertisements prerecorded on a second medium (figs.1-5, col.3, lines 43-col.4, line 17); and a processor configured to generate command signals inserting advertisements read by the reader mechanism from the second medium into entertainment content read by the reader mechanism from the first medium (col.4, line 27-col.5, line 41 and line 51-col.6, line 67).

As to claim 19, Dimitri further discloses where the player device comprises a reader mechanism includes a single optical pickup and where the first and second media are mechanically, sequentially moved for reading (col.3, lines 43-col.4, line 17 and line 27-col.5, line 41).

As to claim 20, Dimitri further discloses where the player device further comprises a memory device configured to store read data to permit seamless, uninterrupted insertion of advertisements into entertainment content (col.4, lines 4-36 and col.5, line 16-col.6, line 1+)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2623

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 5-9, 11, 22-27, 30, 31, 34, 35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)** in view of

Sartain et al (5,914,712).

As to claim 1, note the **Lowthert** reference figures 1-5, discloses content with advertisement information segment and further discloses a method of providing a consumer with entertainment content coupled with updated advertisements, comprising:

Distributing entertainment content pre-recorded on entertainment content storage media to the customer locations, the entertainment content media including insertion points for advertisements; and periodically distributing advertisements pre-recorded on advertisement storage media to the customer locations, where at least some of the advertisements are updated before being distributed (R-10, page 1, [0024-0030] and [0048-0049]);

Where the player devices are configured such that, when a customer inserts an entertainment content medium and an advertisement medium into the player device at the customer's location, the player device displays selected entertainment pre-recorded on the advertisement medium, where the advertisements are displayed at the insertion points (page 2, [0032-0033], [0038], [0043] and [0047]); note the links to R-10 includes CD-ROM, DVD, DVD-R/RW, hard drive, removable hard drive, etc., which are physically insert at the customer location.

Lowthert updates some of previously stored or pre-recorded ads and other content and distributes ads and other content upon request. Lowthert teaches a distributor which employs "sneakernet" a process where ads, content, info segment, etc., stored on CD-ROM, DVD, etc., is distributed via convention mail (physically carried) to various locations (figs.1+ and page 1, [0024]) and one skill in the art knows that these distribution method, e.g., conventional mail, etc., is usually done periodically (monthly). Although, Lowthert sneakernet system does not distribute the same ads or same content to the clients, but rather updates or new content, Lowthert is silent as to periodic distribution.

However, in the same field of endeavor **Sartain** reference figures 1-7, discloses an interactive video system which periodically (once a day, once a week, etc.,) distributes ads and other content via overnight mail to remote sites (col.1, line 56-col.2, line 13, col.5, lines 23-43, col.8, line 29-46, col.9, line 60-col.10, line 26 and line 53-col.11, line 1+).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Sartain into the system of Lowthert to periodically distribute pre-recorded content to remote areas to enable users to update the outdated ads or other content with new ones.

As to claim 5, Lowthert further disclose where each of the ads media includes ads an index of entertainment content (page 2, [0032-0036] and [0039-0040]).

As to claims 6-7, Lowthert further disclose where the advertisements include current movie previews and where the player devices are further configured to display

the movie previews before displaying the selected entertainment content displays selected (page 3, [0036] and [0047-0049]).

As to claims 8-9, Lowthert further where the advertisements include commercial advertisements other than movie previews, where the player devices are configured to display the commercial advertisements other than movie previews before displaying the selected entertainment content (page. 3, [0036] and [0047-0049]).

As to claim 11, Lowthert further teaches generating customer preferences by analysis of customer characteristics and where the player devices are further configured to select a subset of the advertisements contained in the advertisement medium based upon customer preference (page 2, [0035-0036] and [0043-0048]).

As to claim 22, the claimed "A method of providing consumers with entertainment content coupled with updated advertisements..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 23 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 5.

As to claim 24, Lowthert further discloses distributing the items to the customers free of charge (page 1, [0019-0024]).

As to claim 25, Lowthert further discloses where distributing items to customers is at a charge to customers not exceeding production and shipping costs (page 2, [0034-0036] and [0047-0049]).

As to claims 26-27, Lowthert further discloses where the customers are provided with the entertainment content and updated advertisements without the necessity of the customers having cable TV or direct broadcast satellite service and inputting display

signals from a broadcast source into the player device and inserting advertisements pre-recorded on the second medium into the broadcast content (page 1, [0020-0025], [0032-0036] and [0042-0047]).

Claims 30-31 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to claim 34, Lowthert further discloses charging customers for playing entertainment content on a one time fee-to-own basis (page 3, [0063]).

As to claim 35, Lowthert further discloses where communicating information that is representative of the playing of entertainment content and advertisements between the customer and system operator (page 2, [0032-oo36] and [0042-0047]).

Claim 38 is met as previously discussed with respect to claims 12-13.

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dimitri et al (6,574,424)** as applied to claim 18 above, and in view of **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)**.

As to claim 21, Dimitri is silent as to where the player device includes an input for displaying signals from a broadcast content source and inserting advertisements prerecorded on the second medium into the broadcast content.

However, Lowthert discloses a player device with an input (PD-14) for displaying signals from a broadcast content source and inserting advertisements prerecorded on the second medium into the broadcast content (page, [0019] and [0043-0049]).

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in incorporate the teaching of Lowthert into the system of Dimitri to enable the player device to receive signals from other input source(s).

Art Unit: 2623

7. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)** in view of **Sartain et al (5,914,712)** as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and further in view of **Sandstrom (6,238,763)**.

As to claims 12-13 Lowthert further discloses where the first medium comprises a disc having a diameter greater than about 125mm and less than 300mm and where the first medium comprises a disc having data recorded on a reflective layer and an optically transmissive coating having a total transmission of 635nm of less than the minimum transmission set forth as the standard DVD specification (page 2, [0021-0025] and ([0048-0049]).

However, an analogous field endeavor, **Sandstrom** discloses in figures 1-2, rewritable optical data storage disk having enhanced flatness and discloses a disc having a diameter greater than about 120mm and less than 135mm and various substrate thickness and wavelength (col.1, lines 24-44, col.2, lines 24-46, col.3, line 66-col.4, line 31, col.8, line 32-col.9, line 30). Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of are disclosed in the prior art, except for size, it would have been obvious matter of design choice, since such modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component, and change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1995). Additionally, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, except for an optimum value, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reach such an optimum value,

since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify

Lowthert and Sandstrom to construct a disk with additional coating material to enhance recording and provide a desire diameter to meet specification of specific devices.

8. Claims 2-4, 14, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)** in view of **Sartain et al (5,914,712)** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Shear et al (2001/0042043)**.

As to claims 2-3, Lowthert as modified by Sartain, fail to explicitly teach disclose storage medias with hardware security feature where display is possible if the hardware is compatible with the hardware security feature.

However, note the **Shear** reference figures 1-3 and 12-14, discloses storage media electronic rights management in closed and connected appliances which employs hardware security feature and software to permit access to stored or recorded content on stored media (page 6, [0071-0072], [0162-0163], [0212-0213], [0280] and [0319+).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Shear into the system of Lowthert as modified by Sartain to protect content on portable storage media and manage rights to information stored on the portable storage media

Claim 4 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

As to claim 14, Lowthert as modified by Sartain, fail to explicitly teach where the player devices are configured to permit downloading content from the player device to a second portable player device.

However, **Shear** further discloses a method and system that permits player devices to download content from other portable player device ([0054-0055], [0061-0068], [0162-0163], [0212-0213], [0280] and [0319+).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Shear into the system of Lowthert as modified by Sartain to allow other users with portable storage media to share stored content on a master device after meeting certain conditions.

As to claim 36, Lowthert as modified by Sartain teaches all the claim limitation as previously discussed with respect to claim 22 above, but fail to teach "...downloading content..." however, this is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 14.

As to claim 37, Lowthert further teach where the player device includes a projector ([0049])

9. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)** in view of **Sartain et al (5,914,712)** as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of **Ginter et al (2004/0054630)**.

As to claims 28-29, Even though, one skill in the art knows that most conventional mail distribution method is usually done periodically (monthly), Lowthert

sneakernet system is silent as to periodic distribution even though is clear from the disclosure that different or new ads and new content "updates" are distributed in some order to the clients. Lowthert as modified by Sartain, teach periodic distribution of content and targeting content to customer, base on preferences, but silent as to shipping entertainment content.

However, **Ginter** disclose periodic shipping entertainment content on a periodic basis and further teaches targeting content to customer, based on preferences ([0201-0203], [1049] and [1178-1182]).

However, **Ginter** disclose periodic shipping entertainment content on a periodic basis and further teaches periodic shipments base on customer preferences ([0201-0203], [1049] and [1178-1182])

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Ginter into the system of Lowthert as modified by Sartain to physically delivery up to date target content to customers irrespective of their location(s)

10. Claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lowthert et al (2002/0100043)** in view of **Sartain et al (5,914,712)** as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of **Russo (6,732,366)**.

As to claims 32 and 33, Lowthert as modified by Sartain, disclose encrypting content and charging fee for playing the content, but silent to various fee payment methods, such as PPV basis and subscription basis.

Art Unit: 2623

However, **Russo** disclose a pay-per-play system that provides various paying method to enable a user to select a desired payment method, such as PPV basis and subscription basis (col.4, line 39-col.5, line 2 and col.6, line 46-col.7, line 35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Russo into the system of Lowthert as modified by Sartain to enable the user to select an affordable payment method.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2623

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Annan Q. Shang whose telephone number is 571-

272-7355. The examiner can normally be reached on 700am-400pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have guestions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic**

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from

a **USPTO Customer Service Representative** or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Annan Q Shang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Annan Q. Shnag